Date: Sat, 19 Feb 94 17:00:29 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #181
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sat, 19 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 181

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 19 Feb 1994 23:20:29 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!
astro.as.utexas.edu!oo7@ames.arpa
Subject: Callsign allocations
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

hamilton@BIX.com (hamilton on BIX) asks:

>>But what can you do to lookup an international callsign? I'm not
>>aware if there's even an ascii text file out there someplace that would
>>allow me to do even the simplest lookup of the prefix to determine
>>what country it's from. (This month's CQ contains such a list, but

>>you can bet I'm not ready to key it in myself. :-)

>>What machine-readable resources are available for looking up international
>>calls?

   Don't people read words and books by eye any more? The ARRL log
   books and many other sources have all this information listed on
   a couple of pages - you know, printing on paper. When you hear
   an unfamiliar callsign, you look at the piece of paper. It's
   much like looking in a dictionary - a real book, that is, not an
   "on-line word source".

   Can you tell that I was born before computers became popular?

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

Date: 18 Feb 94 17:03:34 GMT
From: concert!inxs.concert.net!rock.concert.net!mikewood@rutgers.rutgers.edu
Subject: Chinese Amateurs Sent to Labor Camps ?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Information was posted on the Southeastern U.S.A. DX Packet
Cluster system last nite that if true is a most disturbing
occurrence.

The posting stated that the Voice of America had reported
that ** all ** radio amateurs in the The Peoples Republic
of China (Radio Prefix BY) had been placed in labor camps.

Does anyone have verification and/or further details of
this situation?

Does the VOA post any news scripts to any Internet locations?

Some amateurs noted that there had been a recent lack of
activity from PRC amateurs but had attributed this to
poor propagation.

If the information proves to be true, I urge you to protest
this action by calls or letters to the PRC Embassy in
your country.

The reported reason fr the action by the way was that all
PRC amateurs "had been monitoring unauthorized frequencies".

Mike Wood Internet: mikewood@rock.concert.net
The Signal Group
P.O. Box 1979 ***Avoid company disclaimers by owning the company ***
Wake Forest, NC 27588

Phone: 919-556-8477 Fax: 919-556-0115

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 1994 22:30:44 -0800
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!mcws!FUsenetToss@ames.arpa
Subject: Coax minimum-loss impeance
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I think the 92 Ohm coax was an attempt to make as high an impedance as
reasonable, since most tube circuits work best at higher impedances.
Anything much higher was very lossy and fragile and expensive, so they
got as close as they could to 100 Ohms. Just a speculation..

73 DE K6DDX

Date: 18 Feb 1994 16:25:49 GMT
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!hamblin.math.byu.edu!news.byu.edu!news.kei.com!
eff!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!
jlw3@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: DJ-580 UHF receive ragne
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Ruentien Lu (ruentien@maverick.Corp.Sun.COM) wrote:
: hi, guys:

: I recently purchase a ALINCO DJ-580, it is a great radio. The quality of audio
is great. I have no complaint about this rig.
: I got one question here, the menu stated the receive range for UHF is from 430
to 470 Mhz, but what I found is that I can make it from 400 to 520 Mhz. I didn't
make any modification on this rig, I don't know this is misinformed on menu?
or .....
: Any answer will be appreciated!!

: PS. I don't have call-sign yet, just pass the test last week.
      ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

you know, I don't think I'd be able to put up with not being able to TX
for two months after getting the radio. you must have some self-discipline!
more than I have at least. Just hope that warrantee doesn't expire too
soon. . . (Note: I'm not implying that there is anything with this radio)

If only the FCC would hurry up!!!

--jesse (57 days and counting--so I guess that's over 8 weeks)

Date: Sat, 19 Feb 94 00:22:47 MST
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!wierius!isus!dtr!
jamoran@ames.arpa
Subject: Frequency Exchange
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

is ther anyone out there that wants to trade frequency lists. I just
finished work on a database of international broadcasters. i also have a
database of Scanner frequencies (Aviation, Air Traffic Control, Transit
systems, Police, Fire departments, State and Federal Government agencies)
most of my entries are for AZ/CA/NM/UT/CO but I have some from other
areas too.
my snail mail address is p.o. box 25506 tempe az 85285 (USA)
                         JOHN MORAN

--
jamoran@dtr.stat.com (John moran)
Data Terminal Ready BBS +1 602 993 4753

Date: Fri, 11 Feb 94 17:02:29 EST
From: info-serv@arrl.org (ARRL HQ AUTOMATED ELECTRONIC MAIL SERVER)
Subject: INFO response: ARRL-EMAIL-ADR
To: yee@ming.mipg.upenn.edu

From: jbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
Subject: ARRL HQ email list
Summary: How to contact ARRL HQ (repost with fixed news feed)
Date: 18 Jan 93 09:59:37 EST
Organization: American Radio Relay League

     The following ARRL HQ staffers AND ONLY THESE STAFFERS can be
     contacted directly via the net at the addresses shown. I've also
     included a brief mention, where appropriate, of some of the specific

duties of the staff member so that you'll know who to contact.

Staff member, call, title	address
Al Brogdon, K3KMO, QST Managing Editor	abrogdon@arrl.org
Brian Battles, WS1O, Features Editor (Strays, New Products, Feature articles)	bbattles@arrl.org
Jon Bloom, KE3Z, Senior Engineer (arrl.org postmaster, QEX editor)	jbloom@arrl.org
Bob Boucher, Purchasing Manager	rboucher@arrl.org
Pete Budnik, KB1HY, Educational Assistant	pbudnik@arrl.org
James Cain, K1TN, QST Senior Editor	jcain@arrl.org
Joe Carcia, NJ1Q, Outgoing QSL Bureau	jcarcia@arrl.org
Mary Carcia, N7IAL, Administrative Assistant to the Chief Financial Officer (ARRL Foundation; scholarships; endowments, bequests and donations)	mcarcia@arrl.org
Lisa Delude, Administrative Assistant to the Executive Vice President	ldelude@arrl.org
Bridget DiCosimo, Technical Department Secretary (article reprints; orbit calendars; PCB templates etc.)	bdicosim@arrl.org
Kathy Fay, Deputy Circulation Manager	kfay@arrl.org
Steve Ford, WB8IMY, Assistant Technical Editor (Operating Manual; packet and satellite books; QST satellite and "Lab Notes" columns)	sford@arrl.org
Mike Gruber, WA1SVF, Laboratory Engineer (product testing)	mgruber@arrl.org
Ed Hare, KA1CV, Laboratory Supervisor (RFI; product testing)	ehare@arrl.org
John Hennessee, KJ4KB, Regulatory Information Specialist (Regulatory questions, "Washington Mailbox" column,	jhenness@arrl.org

FCC Rule Book)	
Tom Hogerty, KC1J, DXCC Manager	thogerty@arrl.org
Luck Hurder, KY1T, Field Services Dept. Deputy Manager (Clubs; Field Organization; ARRL telephone BBS)	lhurder@arrl.org
Chuck Hutchinson, K8CH, Membership Services Manager (Contests; awards; DXCC etc.)	chutch@arrl.org
Bob Inderbitzen, NQ1R, Assistant to the Manager, Educational Activities	rinderbi@arrl.org
Bart Jahnke, KB9NM, Volunteer Examiner Department Manager (Exams, VE coordination, etc.)	bjahnke@arrl.org
Debra Jahnke, Circulation Manager	djahnke@arrl.org
Jim Kearman, KR1S, Assistant Technical Editor (books)	jkearman@arrl.org
Bill Kennamer, K5FUV, DXCC Specialist	bkennamer@arrl.org
Joel Kleinman, N1BKE, Associate Technical Editor (in charge of editing technical books)	jkleinma@arrl.org
Kirk Kleinschmidt, NT0Z, QST Assistant Managing Editor	kkleinsc@arrl.org
Lisa Kustosik, Administrative Assistant, Regulatory Information Branch	lkustosi@arrl.org
Greg Kwasowski, Building Manager	gkwasows@arrl.org
Zack Lau, KH6CP, Laboratory Engineer (RF/microwave circuit design, QRP)	zlau@arrl.org
Billy Lunt, KR1R, Contest Manager	blunt@arrl.org
Steve Mansfield, N1MZA, Public Relations Manager (news stories, etc.)	smansfie@arrl.org
Tony Mascaro, Comptroller	amascaro@arrl.org

Jay Mabey, NU0X, Repeater Directory Editor	jmabey@arrl.org
John Nelson, W1GNC, Planning and Financial Analysis Manager	jnelson@arrl.org
Dave Newkirk, WJ1Z, QST Senior Assistant Technical Editor (Hints & Kinks)	dnewkirk@arrl.org
Paul Pagel, N1FB, QST Associate Technical Editor (in charge of QST technical editing, Technical Correspondence)	ppagel@arrl.org
Rick Palm, K1CE, Field Services Manager (Field Organization matters)	rpalm@arrl.org
Deane Potter, Information Services Manager	dpotter@arrl.org
Bob Schetgen, KU7G, Assistant Technical Editor (ARRL Handbook)	rschetge@arrl.org
Kevin Sheheen, Information Services	ksheheen@arrl.org
Barry Shelley, Chief Financial Officer	bshelley@arrl.org
Dean Straw, N6BV, Senior Assistant Technical Editor	rdstraw@arrl.org
Dave Sumner, K1ZZ, Executive Vice President (policy matters, HQ administration)	dsumner@arrl.org
Glenn Swanson, KB1GW, Assistant to the Manager, ARRL VEC	gswanson@arrl.org
Brad Thomas, KC1EX, Advertising Manager	bthomas@arrl.org
Michael Tracy, KC1SX, Technical Information Services Coordinator	mtracy@arrl.org
Lori (Maty) Weinberg, Assistant to the Publications Manager (QEX editorial assistant)	lweinber@arrl.org
Rosalie White, WA1STO, Educational Activities Department Manager (info on becoming a ham/training/SAREX)	rwhite@arrl.org
Perry Williams, W1UED, Washington Area Coordinator (National Legislation and	2242662@mcimail.com

Regulatory Affairs)	
Mark Wilson, AA2Z, QST Editor	mwilson@arrl.org
Larry Wolfgang, WR1B, Senior Assistant Technical Editor (Beginner's books, license manuals)	lwolfgan@arrl.org
Tammy-Beth Zimmerman, KA1WWP, Membership Services Administrative Assistant (DXCC, awards, QSL buro)	tzimmer@arrl.org

In addition to these specific people, we've also set up the following accounts:

Automated Information Service (information files on Amateur Radio)	info@arrl.org
Education Activities Department	ead@arrl.org
Technical Information Service (Technical questions)	tis@arrl.org
DXCC Desk	dxcc@arrl.org
Awards (WAS, etc.)	awards@arrl.org
Contests	contests@arrl.org
Outgoing QSL Bureau	buro@arrl.org
QEX Magazine	qex@arrl.org
W1AW	76067.3724@compuserve.com

Other questions and messages to other specific HQ staff members should continue to be addressed to "2155052@mcimail.com" which will result in their receipt in the "front office" here at ARRL HQ. You should include your postal address (the slow kind) in case we need to send you nonelectronic material in answer to your request.

Other useful addresses:

Tom Frenaye, K1KI, Vice President	2349723@mcimail.com
Frank Butler, W4RH, Southeastern Division Director	3113659@mcimail.com

     Stan Horzepa, WA1LOU, QST (Packet   horzepa@evax.gdc.com
        Perspective) columnist

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St. |
Newington, CT 06111 |

Justice is being allowed to do whatever I like. Injustice is whatever prevents my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

--

Medical Image Processing Group | Conway Yee, N2JWQ
411 Blockley Hall | EMAIL : yee@mipg.upenn.edu
418 Service Drive | VOICE : 1 (215) 662-6780
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6021 (USA) | FAX   : 1 (215) 898-9145

Date: 19 Feb 94 22:41:28 GMT
From: agate!news.Brown.EDU!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!BIX.com!hamilton@ames.arpa
Subject: International callsigns and prefixes
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

If you'd like to look up a US ham's callsign to get his name and address, etc., that's easy: either telnet to callsign.cs.buffalo.edu or (much better!) go buy a copy of the Walnut Creek QRZ! CD-ROM for $30.

But what can you do to lookup an international callsign? I'm not aware if there's even an ascii text file out there someplace that would allow me to do even the simplest lookup of the prefix to determine what country it's from. (This month's CQ contains such a list, but you can bet I'm not ready to key it in myself. :-)

What machine-readable resources are available for looking up international calls?

Regards,
Doug Hamilton hamilton@bix.com Ph 508-358-5715
Hamilton Laboratories, 13 Old Farm Road, Wayland, MA 01778-3117

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 1994 20:33:35 GMT
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srgenprp!glenne@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Medium range point-to-point digital links
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

: I've looked at your design. It's certainly simple for the performance
: it promises, but I doubt you could sell it for under $100 per end with
: ham market size volumes. The DSY modem kit is not very different in
: complexity, yet GRAPES can't sell it that cheap. I believe you probably
: mean that a good scrounger could gather the parts that cheap. If you
: can offer a kit for $100 per end, I'll take two right away. I have a

I'm definitely not an amateur manufacturing type but I greatly
appreciate the difficulty of producing (kitting is probably even worse)
almost anything of this type for sale. Process and production issues
are often a bigger task/cost than the original design itself. However,
from a complexity and parts count point of view, if one compares to
existing high volume hardware (we may already be out of the camp of
amateur radio) I think that lowcost microwave transceivers could be
built. As I've previously mentioned, another 10-20 dB of system
performance over the 10 GHz stuff at about the same cost/complexity I
showed is readily available should someone choose to go after it.

  As I've also repeatedly said, the 10 GHz link was a "teaser" and never
even intended to be used for more than a demonstration. The fact that
people have built and used them is incidental. That design is certainly
not one I would choose to manufacture if I did choose to get into the
business.
  I do believe that $100 h/w is a possibility given volume production
though. Existing automotive radar detectors are similar in complexity.
In fact some of them are probably considerably more complex.

: one mile through-the-trees link I need to make right now. A pair of
: Wavelan cards feeding Down East loop yagis won't make it, but 100 mw
: HTs at 70 cm make it fine, as can a pair of GRAPES 56kb modens feeding
: 70 cm transverters (but I can't do that because I need them for another
: link). BTW, a BER better than 1 in 10^6 is no problem with the DSY design
: with 1.0 microvolt of signal into the modem.

I think you really need to be careful to compare apples and apples. 100
mw HTs aren't anything close to the video bandwidths which I was
discussing. Also, with the narrower bandwidth and low data rate,
multipath distortion and the resulting intersymbol interference (or
phase distortion as it is sometimes called) isn't nearly so significant.
I think that a BER of better than 1e-6 may be difficult in many or most
non-LOS situations without error correction and/or channel equalization
(whether through brute force means or with spread spectrum). Even at
only GRAPES speeds this is an issue. I would point to the Ottowa
group's experiences and VE3JF's CNC article as a reference.

While the excess path loss degrades more slowly at lower frequencies than at microwave I maintain that as soon as one gets into high information transfer situations that multipath and path variation cause similar difficulties and make indirect paths uneconomical or impossible. When you have lots of margin to throw away (low data rates) it does indeed appear that low frequencies win. When you start pushing performance and high information transfer (lots of users over a wide area) they fail badly, even before the consideration of sufficient available spectrum is applied. I believe that this is the fundamental reason that terrestrial radio links have all been at microwave. It makes economic sense.

: Well sure, pure line of sight definitely makes things better, witness
: TVRO systems that make 22,500 miles on 50 watts or less. However, we
: don't get that kind of performance out of our terrestrial TV links.
: First of all, the bandwidth required for our TV links isn't 6 MHz,
: it's 30 MHz, because we use FM video. Of course the FM enhancement
: effect mitigates that somewhat. And second, we rarely have pure line

I used traditional TV bandwidths in my example because they were more conservative/demanding. In using 6 MHz and 45 dB C/N instead of 35 MHz and 13 dB C/N (or your favorite number near that for a TVRO system) I was requiring about 25 dB *more* signal than a TVRO style system. If you allow the TVRO system you can increase the previous estimated distances by a factor of 16 or so.

: of sight. Finally, the bulk of the path loss occurs in the first
: mile, 119.27 db at 13 GHz. After that the incremental losses are
: rather small, another 3 db for every doubling of distance.

Wow! I stand corrected. Things must work differently where you are. The darn signals drop 6 dB when you double the distance out here in California. This happens every time you double it, the second mile or the second hundred (or pretty close to it up through 10 GHz) as long as you're LOS.

: a 40 foot mast. So pure LOS is pretty much a mountaintop to mountaintop
: affair for longer distances.

Yes it is unless a lot more path engineering is done than amateurs are used to doing. However, if we are ever to get high information rate systems we are going to *have* to pay attention to details. Once we do this, those details will be made more economic as we use microwave/millimeter (if all of amateur radio hasn't been scooped by fiber by then) wavelengths.

: > While it's true that you would need line-of-sight, I think most
: >practical installations of a lower frequency system also incur

: >15-40 dB incremental path loss once they leave LOS conditions and
: >for higher information rate transmission effectively need LOS in order
: >to stay economic.

: Well lets look at a 219 MHz system with a 11 db antenna at 40 feet

I'm discussing higher speed systems. Links of the type required to
trunk a significant number of users with moderate to high bandwidth
applications across the US. 1 MHz at 219 is not going to be
able to support such without a tremendous amount of spacial reuse
which probably means antennas so large as to be impractical.

: That gives us a margin of 95.87 db. Looks like we can easily tolerate
: 15-40 db of foliage and building loss in the path. For the same path,
: it looks like foliage losses at 10 GHz are about 30 db more, for a
: total of about 198 db at 10 GHz, or about 20 db below your system's
: noise floor worst case.

Yes, if you don't need much performance you can use lower frequencies,
you can lose a lot of the *potential* performance and still function.
For that matter you can run 60 wpm rtty on HF across great distances if
that's your goal.

  My point is that once you try to get economical performance at high
information rates you can't afford to throw away power into poorly
engineered paths and that the economics greatly favor microwave over vhf
for wireless systems.

: >Also, at high information rates, the additional multipath and path :
: >variability problems incurred by going to a non-LOS path make the UHF :
: >solution even less attractive since error correction, channel equalization
: >and additional system margin may be required to guarantee data flow.

: Ok. Lets take a look at beyond horizon signals. If we assume forward

Let's not. Once you've done that you have thrown away so much system
capability that it is beyond amateur resources. I don't think
most of us are ready to install multi-killiwatt troposcatter systems
of the kind the military used at low vhf to island hop in the Pacific.
And that's about what it takes if you are talking about medium speed
information (though I suspect the military stuff was more or less audio
bandwidths).

  If you did consider long haul, I suspect that microwave might do
better than many expect. During the 10GHz over-land DX record tests we
did a few years ago, both the strongest and the most reliable signals
heard across the 415 mile path were at 10 GHz. They were the strongest
when the ducting occurred and they were the most reliable in that the 1

watt into a *30 inch* diameter antenna was always copiable via troposcatter. This was true even though we had liaison on 40M SSB, 144 MHz (1/4 KW and long yagis each end) and 432 MHz. However,neither of those propagation mechanisms is one I would want to consider for high rate information transfer.

: Now back to the real world. We have a 90 mile 70 cm path between Sweat
: Mtn and Scaly Mtn that is not line of sight. It works with very few
: retries. We're using 19 db antennas on each end, and our mean HAAT is
: about 1300 feet, but with mountains taller than that in between. I won't
: claim that's typical. We've got another link that's only 21 miles,
: and line of sight, that doesn't work well. But one end is nestled
: in downtown buildings and suffers severe multipath (and desense from
: commercial equipment too). The tighter beamwidth of your system would
: probably be a win here.

Your second 21 mile link obviously *isn't* LOS!
Local clutter is probably degrading things severely.
Antennas help a lot (2 dB of system improvement per dB of antenna gain) but a poor path degrades things much faster than antennas can fix it.
That "nestled end" that you call line-of-sight is clearly far from it. See my comment above about most practical links losing 15-40 dB as soon as they leave LOS. Your link is probably an example of this.

: To summarize, if we could depend on having LOS paths, a 10 GHz system
: would be ideal, but in the real world we probably can't afford the
: number of hops that would require (except in special terrain cases
: like the California coast with it's mountains overlooking the population
: areas), and 219 MHz calculations seem to show it will suffice using
: troposcatter over the much longer paths we are likely to need in our
: rolling terrain.

If we are willing to settle for low information rate to each user I agree. However, if we are considering medium speed or greater, as defined by the industry, culture and available systems, and if we are considering more than a single or a few users, 219 MHz capacity isn't going to come close to being enough to interest hams and potential hams in "investing". Even now it is difficult to convince people that ham radio is neat for information age services when a 14.4 kbps or 28.8 kbps modem is so cheap and provides so much performance *to the user* compared to anything AR has to offer.

Glenn Elmore n6gn

Date: 18 Feb 94 14:27:55
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!msuinfo!netnews.upenn.edu!

mipg.upenn.edu!yee@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Probable demise of the online repeater directory project
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

As number of us on Internet have been compiling an online repeater database which is intended for distribution via such avenues such as Usenet. I am sure that many are aware of the usefulness of such a database. Instead of being restricted to the organization favored by others, the individual can sort the database by frequency (to take advantage of band openings) or by location (in the sense that a user can customize the data for a particular long distance trip). Further, such a database can be more easily kept up to date and could be used for all sorts of modern modes of communication. One prime example is the use of the database in the same manner that the callbook database is used. Another would be its use on World Wide Web.

This is a project started by hams and for the benefit of hams. It is entirely for the benefit of the Amateur Service. The charter of the ARRL specifically states that it promotes "interest in Amateur Radio communication and experimentation" and stands "for the advancement of radio art." The online database is entirely with the spirit of these goals. Even though it is unfinished, unanticipated benefits already have been found.

Before embarking upon this project, I checked with some people involved in the public distribution of electronic texts (etexts) and was told that mere FACTS are not copyrighted and that only the format was under copyright. The data format chosen for the online database is in a database format, not the format used by the ARRL repeater directory. A portion of the facts contained within the online directory, however, do have their origins in the various incarnations of the ARRL repeater directory.

Recently, I recieved a polite letter from the ARRL lawyers threatening legal action if I continue on this project. Specifically, they state that the ARRL owns the FACTS present in the repeater directory and that the format of the database infringes upon the ARRL copyright.

I have sent email to all the people at ARRL HQ who could possibly have something to say on the matter with several questions.

1) Is it the position of the ARRL that it owns the FACTS present within the ARRL repeater directory and that no use whatsoever can be made of these facts?

2) I about the ARRL views on how the format of the online repeater directory infringes upon the ARRL copyright. I note that there are only a small number of ways that it is possible to enter the facts

> into a database. Is it the contention of the ARRL that it owns them all? If not, how may the existing format be modified? One possible choice would be to sort the entries or the format of the entries in a different manner (i.e. by frequency or call). It is possible that the ARRL is concerned with only a part of the format but the letter sent is not clear on the matter.

I am sure that the net aware that I am individual and in no way capable of matching the legal resources that the ARRL can place against me. The ARRL lawyers can litigate and achieve whatever aims that the ARRL wishes even if I am entirely correct. Nevertheless, I am interested in pursuing the completion of an online repeater directory because I believe that it is something that is in the best interests of the Amateur service. Since the ARRL is a membership organization "of, by and for the radio amateur," I am hoping that some compromise can be made without jeopardizing the utility of the online repeater directory.

Until such time as this matter is clarified, there will be no further updates of the online repeater directory. In fact, version 0.03 may be the last public release. I simply can not afford to defend myself against legal action. As they say, "might makes right" and "no good deed goes unpunished." I am sorry to say that the way things appear at this time, the online repeater directory project will not exist without permission from the ARRL.

I append below the list of people in ARRL HQ who are net accessible below. This list SHOULD not infringe upon the ARRL copyright as it was posted previously in this forum and is available for free from the ARRL info server.

Date: 19 Feb 94 19:43:07 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ddsw1!indep1!clifto@ames.arpa
Subject: Probable demise of the online repeater directory project
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <YEE.94Feb18143836@mipgsun.mipg.upenn.edu> yee@mipg.upenn.edu (Conway Yee) writes:
>Recently, I recieved a polite letter from the ARRL lawyers threatening
>legal action if I continue on this project. Specifically, they state
>that the ARRL owns the FACTS present in the repeater directory and
>that the format of the database infringes upon the ARRL copyright.

So, even though they know better (or should), they seem to be making a thinly-veiled threat of intensive litigation apparently designed to bankrupt you into compliance.

Yet another reason I vote with my dollars; I have never been, and will never be, an ARRL member.

How about publishing the letter on the net? I, for one, would like to ask the FCC about private and restricted-use ownership of its de-facto database of officially coordinated repeaters.

Maybe I'm being too harsh. After all, ARRL stands to lose a great deal if someone comes up with an alternative to their repeater directory; it's intuitively obvious to the most casual observer that every ham will save the few bucks and replace the copies they keep in their backpacks and glove compartments with laptop computers and very long fiber optic cables connected to their Internet providers. This would financially sap the organization and leave them unable to protect their publishing income. I know personally I'd run right out and spend $15,000 on a laptop and miles of fiber to do THAT.

--

+---+
| Cliff Sharp | |
| WA9PDM | |
+---+

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 94 22:06:29 MST
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!stat!david@ames.arpa
Subject: Satellite Tracking Programs
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am interested in obtaining a good satellite tracking program for tracking some of the amateur birds. Recommendations on shareware / commercial packages would be appreciated.

David wb7tpy

Editor, HICNet Medical Newsletter
Internet: david@stat.com FAX: +1 (602) 451-1165
Bitnet : ATW1H@ASUACAD

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 94 22:05:19 MST
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!stat!david@ames.arpa
Subject: Scandinavian Repeaters

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I will be taking a trip to Scandanavia in the near future ... can anyone
fill me in on the VHF/UHF repeater situation?

David wb7tpy

Editor, HICNet Medical Newsletter
Internet: david@stat.com FAX: +1 (602) 451-1165
Bitnet : ATW1H@ASUACAD

Date: Sat, 19 Feb 1994 15:38:37 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!spider!raft.spider.co.uk!
jmorris@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <N4HY.94Feb9140932@harder.ccr-p.ida.org>,
<1994Feb11.140442.11801@tellab5.tellabs.com>, <CLAC34.Dq@cscsun.rmc.edu>
Subject : Re: Hamblaster update

In article <CLAC34.Dq@cscsun.rmc.edu> dtiller@cscsun.rmc.edu (Dave Tiller) writes:
>John W. Albert (jwa@tellabs.com) wrote:
>: The Hamblaster Update
>
>: Over the past several months I posted updates about a
>: DSP "The Hamblaster" that Will Torgrim (N9PEA) and myself
>: are developing.
>:
>: Several weeks ago I mentioned that the projected cost for
>: the board would be about $350.00. It was just a
>: "guessestmate". It looks like it will be more in the $275.00
>: range and could be as low as $250.00. This may still sound
>: high compared to the Soundblaster or other sound cards, but
>: you have to remember that it's made exclusivly for Ham Radio
>: and it won't have the volume (sales) of other sound cards.
>
>
>Is it just me, or is anyone else wondering why we're being continually
>bombarded with a blatantly commercial posting? I'm glad they've taken
>the initiative to make a new piece of hardware for hams, but I don't think
>this is the proper forum for their continous ads disguised as status
>reports.

I find some of them interesting, and skip the ones that I don't. It's
often hard to know what is going on in other parts of the world for

such a specialised community as radio amateurs. So I don't object to this type of posting - at the level I have seen them recently, anyway. However, I take your point, and wonder if some gentle pointing at rec.radio.amateur.\ equipment might be in order? Or maybe even a new group, such as rec.radio.\ amateur.commercial? Just a thought.

>--
>David Tiller | Network Administrator | Voice: (804) 752-7373 |
>dtiller@rmc.edu | Randolph-Macon College| Fax: (804) 752-7231 |
>n2kau@wa4ong.va.usa.na | P.O. Box 5005 | ICBM: 37d 42' 43.75" N |
>+++Arch-Conservative+++ | Ashland, Va 23005 | 77d 31' 32.19" W |
                                                          ^^^
Now the _real_ reason for posting, hi - do you change this if you shift far enough to make it wrong - say about a foot away? :-)

J.

--
John Morris != Spider Systems jmorris@spider.co.uk GM4ANB@GB7EDN.#77.GBR.EU

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #181
****
****